

**ENTERED**

March 19, 2021

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

BRIAN WILLIAM DOUD,

Plaintiff,

VS.

NATASHA MCMILLION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:19-CV-374

**ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Julie Hampton's Memorandum and Recommendation (M&R). (D.E. 60). The M&R recommends that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, construed as a Rule 60(b) motion for relief from judgment, be denied. (D.E. 59).

Plaintiff was provided proper notice of, and the opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's M&R.<sup>1</sup> *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. No objection has been filed. When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge's M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam); *Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, LP*, No. CIV. A. H-14-2700, 2015 WL 3823141, at \*1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015).


Having carefully reviewed the proposed findings and conclusions of the Magistrate

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's mail was returned as undeliverable. *See* (D.E. 63; D.E. 64). Since then, the Court has waited an appropriate amount of time for an updated address. As a party, Plaintiff is required to keep the Court apprised of his current address at all times and has failed to do so.

Judge, the record, and the applicable law, and finding that the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, the Court **ADOPTS** the M&R in its entirety. (D.E. 60). Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, construed as a Rule 60(b) motion for relief from judgment, be **DENIED**. (D.E. 59).

SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID S. MORALES  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: Corpus Christi, Texas  
March 19, 2021